THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A STUDY OF PROTESTANT CHARITIES IN CHICAGO WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSES AND SOCIAL SETTLEMENTS

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

P. MATHEW TITUS

PRIVATE EDITION, DISTRIBUTED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1939

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A STUDY OF PROTESTANT CHARITIES IN CHICAGO WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSES AND SOCIAL SETTLEMENTS

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

P. MATHEW TITUS

PRIVATE EDITION, DISTRIBUTED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1939

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

PREFACE

Interpretation of religion as a form of social behavior implies that Christianity is the social behavior of those who call themselves Christians. Denominational diversities are thus differentiations in social behavior. Social institutions which Christian denominations establish inevitably reflect the distinctive ideas and ideals of respective groups. Social service agencies are no exception to this rule.

In a functional division of social service agencies three different types are recognized: eleemosynary agencies—e. g., agencies for the care of children, the aged, the sick, and the destitute; character-building agencies—e. g., boys' clubs, girls' clubs, boarding homes for girls, etc.; and community-building agencies—e. g., neighborhood houses and social settlements.

Denominational behavior in the field of social work in Chicago follows certain definite patterns. Different Protestant denominations concentrate their activities in one or the other of the fields mentioned above. Such differences are correlated to the distinctive ideologies of the respective groups. Social service as an act of piety results in ameliorative activities, as the expression of loyalty to Christ and the promotion of personal perfection lead to the sponsorship of character-building and evangelical institutions, and as "social redemption" leads to the establishment of community-building agencies. Thus the types of social service agencies each group sponsors reveal the basic philosophy of social work of the respective groups.

This study was made under the direction of Dr. Holt and Dr. Kincheloe. Their patient counsel, suggestions, criticism, and encouragement have been of most valuable help in the completion of this thesis. The writer is also indebted to Miss Lucie Carner of the Council of Social Agencies of Chicago, to Miss Marguerite K. Sylla of the University of Chicago Settlement, and to Mr. Frank D. Loomis of the Community Fund of Chicago for extending the privilege of using their respective office files, from which useful data were gathered.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41533925_0143

I

Social Expressions of Denominations

Creedal differences of denominations are apparent, irrespective of their narrow margins. Social sources of denominationalism have been traced to different economic classes.[1] In examining the social work of the different major Protestant denominations in Chicago, we find that their social expressions are also different. Thus we find that within the ecumenical process itself, variations in "faith and order," "social sources," and "social expressions" are noticeable. The creedal faith, social constituency, and modes of social expression are interrelated within a denomination. But this interrelatedness is distinctive for each denomination and is different in each case.

The religious stream has flowed through particular channels to irrigate particular areas in distinctive ways. Otherwise, why is it that the Lutheran denomination, with the largest number of churches, members, and social service agencies, is concerned mainly with the care of orphans, the aged, the sick, and the destitute, and has not established a single neighborhood house? Why do the Episcopalians have social service agencies of all types, while Congregationalists have none excepting neighborhood houses? Why is it that Presbyterians and Congregationalists have sponsored the largest number of neighborhood houses when compared with other denominations? Why do they emphasize the community-building aspect of the same, while Methodists emphasize evangelism?

Denominational behavior in the field of social work in Chicago follows certain definite patterns. Different Protestant denominations concentrate their activities in one or the other of three major types of service. Denominations with continental European backgrounds have in the main established eleemosynary agencies. Those of British-American origin have established either character-building and evangelizing agencies (viz., boys' clubs, girls' clubs, boarding houses, institutional churches, etc.), as in the case of Methodists and Baptists, or have neighborhood houses (community-building agencies) as illustrated in the behavior of Congregational and Presbyterian denominations. Episcopalians, like the Catholics, have the diocesan or parish pattern and have organized their charities on that basis.

[1]Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York: Holt and Co., 1929).

Such differences in denominational behavior are correlated with the distinctive historical traditions and ideologies of the respective groups. Social service, as an act of individual piety, has expressed itself in ameliorative activities; as an expression of loyalty to Christ and promotion of personal perfection, it has led to the sponsorship of character-building and evangelical institutions; and as social redemption, it has directed energies in community-building activities. Thus the types of social service agencies sponsored by each group reveal the basic philosophy of social work of the respective groups.

If, as Richard Niebuhr claims, the central core of American Christianity has been the "Kingdom of God";[1] and if, as Aubrey maintains, "practical" activity is its distinctive feature;[2] this "practical" activity towards the establishment of the "Kingdom of God" has taken varied routes. The major source of difference is in the relative emphasis each denomination lays on its ethical system, rather than the economic status.

It may be argued that the Methodist and Baptist churches, being the "poor man's churches," had naturally the need to establish orphanages, old people's homes, etc., because of their poverty and hence comparatively more dependent poor in the churches. The social sources of Presbyterian and Congregational denominations being the middle class, orphans and old people in those churches were well taken care of by their respective relatives, so that they had no need for orphanages and old people's homes. Hence they chose to establish neighborhood houses and social settlements. That being the case, Episcopalians, who belong to the upper-middle class, also should have behaved in the same way as the Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Moreover, Niebuhr maintains that the Methodist and Baptist denominations, though mainly drawn from the lower class, in the early days have raised their economic status and have become middle class.[3]

The ethical teachings are varied in different denominations. The gospel of "salvation by Faith," as Luther preached, made piety all-important and charity secondary. Any idea of considering ethical or social enterprise as conducive to salvation was almost blasphemous to Luther. He thought it was born out of a desire for the "filthy rags of righteousness." He considered the Epistle of St. James as "an epistle of straw" because of its emphasis on good works. According to Luther, good works were the fruits of salvation, and spontaneity and purity of motive were the two main tests of charity. The main concern of every individual was to seek "justification by Faith."

[1] *The Kingdom of God in America* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937)

[2] Edwin E. Aubrey, "The Promise of American Theology," *Christendom*, III, No. 2 (Spring, 1938), 177-89.

[3] Niebuhr, *Social Sources of Denominationalism*, p. 72.

> As the soul needs the word alone for life and justification, so it is justified by faith alone, and not by any works..... Therefore, the first care of every Christian ought to be to lay aside all reliance on works, and to strengthen his faith alone more and more.[1]
>
> Good and pious works never make a good and pious man, but a good and pious man always does good works. As trees must be before the fruits, and the fruits make the trees neither good nor bad, but the trees the fruit, so must a man be pious or evil in his heart before he does good or evil works.[2]

The explanation for the concentration of Lutheran denomination in eleemosynary activities is this historical tradition of overemphasis on Faith and undervaluation of good works in the scheme of salvation. Such a teaching "emptied religion of its social content, and the society of its soul."

Another strand of religion recognized the value of ethical behaviour, but it was the appeal of the "individual gospel," exhorting personal ethics.

Personal ethics produce philanthropy, and the Kingdom of God is meant to have its abode in the hearts of men. The effort is to "pluck the brand out of the burning" and to help in the perfection of a "Christ-like character." The mainspring of charitable impulse here is in the emotional loyalty to Christ and everything is done for Christ's sake.[3] The saying, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of these little ones, ye have done it unto me," forms the basis of appeal. Christ and the individual are placed in the center in direct personal relationship. The individual's desire for recognition, response, security, adventure, and loyalty have full opportunity for satisfaction through a mystical devotion to Christ. The Kingdom of God is within the hearts of men and the "reign of Christ" in the multiplicity of individual souls brings about social conduct in line with the "Will of God." The Methodist tradition has followed such a pattern. The democratic gospel of Methodism was the availability of a free, full, and present salvation to all who believed in Jesus Christ. Forgiveness, regeneration, adoption, inward assurance, entire sanctification, and eternal life after death were available stage by stage to all.

[1] Quoted in R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1926), p. 101.

[2] Quoted by Egon Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age*, trans. C. F. Atkinson (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1930), I, 258.

[3] An illustration of this is found in Benjamin Franklin's autobiography. Once Franklin offered to extend hospitality to Mr. Whitefield on the latter's visit to Philadelphia. Whitefield thankfully replied, saying that if Franklin had made that kind offer for Christ's sake, he should not miss a reward. Franklin replied: "Don't let me be mistaken; it was not for Christ's sake, but for your sake" (*Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. W. Rin [New York: Garden City, 1925], p. 196).

But what did they mean by salvation? From what sins were the souls saved?

> Now it is evident in Wesley's case that he envisaged sin as individual vice and laxity, not as greed, oppression, or social maladjustment. Sin meant sensuality rather than selfishness to him and from Wesley the entire Methodist movement took its ethical character. Wesley was more offended by blasphemous use of the name of God than by a blasphemous use of His creatures. He was much more concerned about swearing in soldiers' camp than about the ethical problem of war, the useless sacrifice of soldiers' lives or the righteousness of their cause..... Apparently Wesley believed that the justice of a cause was quite secondary in the eyes of God to the personal purity of its defenders..... The social ethics of Methodism was an ethics of philanthropy and humanitarianism, which regarded movements toward equality as concessions made out of love rather than as demands of justice, and this philanthropy suffered the constant danger of degenerating into sentimental charity.[1]

Wesley's teachings about the acquisition and use of wealth were also in line with humanitarianism rather than for correct ethical conduct in the pursuit of wealth.

> We ought not to prevent people from being diligent and frugal; we must exhort all Christians to gain all they can, and to save all they can; that is in effect to grow rich. What way then can we take, that our money may not sink us into the nethermost hell? There is one way and there is no other under heaven. If those who gain all they can, and save all they can, will likewise give all they can, the more they will grow in grace, and the more treasures they will lay up in heaven.[2]

Wesley's formula worked and many Methodists gained and saved wealth but preferred to keep it to themselves rather than to exchange it for treasures in heaven. When and where they did give all they could, the donor was assured of some post-mortem reward.

Methodism allowed the millinerian hope to lapse. In place of the concept of the Kingdom, the symbol of heaven was substituted. Perfection of individual character was the keynote of the gospel and perfection of society was inevitable, so they thought, when society became a community of saints. Methodism, described by Wesley himself as the religion of the heart, exhorted mercy which "blesseth him that gives and him that receives." Community-building programs were alien to such a form of ethics.

[1] Niebuhr, *Social Sources of Denominationalism*, pp. 67—68.

[2] Southey, II, 805, quoted in Niebuhr, *ibid.*, pp. 70—71. Cf. W. W. Sweet, *Methodism in American History* (Chicago: The Methodist Book Concern, 1933), p. 336.

To be sure, Methodism has moved far ahead from the old-time individual evangelism to social evangelicalism. But this new orientation has been comparatively a slow process and the historical tradition of Methodist ethics has had its retarding influence.

An individual who prays in earnestness, "Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth" naturally lives and works for the accomplishment of that task. Social ethics demanding social justice directed towards the establishment of a new social order becomes the basis of all action. On the other hand, one who in personal loyalty to Christ bases his social action on the saying, "In as much as you have done it unto one of these, you have done it unto me," attempts to refine his personal conduct towards individual perfection. Methodism as "heart religion" was more at home with the latter than with the former form of ethics.

Capitalism is often recognized as the daughter of the "doctrine of election," and thus the grand-daughter of Calvinism. But Calvin was also the apostle of theocracy. Apart from all the militant rigid discipline, intolerance, and cruel tyrannies, Calvin started out to build the "City of God" within the corporation limits of the Swiss municipality. John Knox extended the limits and asked himself, "If a city can be governed for God, why not a Kingdom? If Geneva, why not Scotland?"

Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, having their rootage in Calvinism, inherited the purposive social idealism and the hope of building society in conformity to the will of God. Self-discipline, diligence, individual responsibility, and "intramundane asceticism" were virtues to be cultivated, not for personal perfection, but as preparatory to the accomplishment of a social task. They were to be an army of disciplined soldiers whose iron hands were to be sanctified and tempered into steel, to march into Canaan to build a new Jerusalem. Judging from the goal set by Calvinistic tradition, it may be safely said that social ethics formed the keynote and social redemption the task and hope. Thus, in all subsequent periods, this goal was recalled as the major objective. The "social gospel" movement found itself quite at home in this tradition. That strand of religious movement in America which was taken up by William E. Channing, Theodore Parker, Horace Bushnell, Graham Taylor, and other social prophets, had its rootage in this tradition. They sought to reconstitute the "American Dream" in terms of a "blessed community" planted on American soil. Towards this end, community-building agencies such as neighbourhood houses and social settlements were established in large numbers by Presbyterians and Congregationalists.

Even in the mission fields we notice the same differentiations. The only social settlement in India was established by the Congregationalists. The Allahabad Agricultural College, established by the Presbyterians, is an evangelism that helps the poor peasant to grow corn and to increase his earthly treasures for a healthy

life. Sholapur Settlement, recently handed over to the Nationalist Government of Bombay by the Congregational mission board, was a type of social evangelism which helped a caste of professional thieves to rehabilitate themselves as good citizens.

Varieties of social expressions reflect the genius and heritage of particular denominations. A common tradition and loyalty to the same Master who gave the gospel of salvation urges Christian churches to promote ecumenicalism. But the varieties in the interpretation of the meaning and technique of salvation, and the resultant variations in social expressions, encourage ecumenicalism in terms of a common task rather than a common tradition. Interdenominational co-operation is indicative of a partial expression of ecumenical attitudes. But the non-sectarian social service agencies are the social expressions of a functional ecumenicalism that gripped the imagination of the Protestant laity earlier than when the churches were ready to co-operate.

Non-Sectarianism in Social Service.

Non-sectarianism in social service is not anti-religious, but only anti-sectarian in its philosophy. It is co-operative social action in the face of human needs, interpreting and extending the parish idea in terms of the city rather than of any particular religious sect. Removal of ecclesiastical control and rendering of service with no theological, ethnic, or other reserve in respect to the choice of clientele are the basic features of non-sectarian agencies. It is not a lamentable secularization of social service, but a creditable socialization of practical Christianity. It was through the efforts of non-sectarian groups that the Charity Organization Movement, the National Conference of Charities and Correction, community chests, Councils of Social Agencies, schools for the training of social workers, and such other national and local enterprises were organized and sponsored.

Of the 494[1] social service agencies in Chicago, 222, or 45 per cent, are classified as non-sectarian; 147, or 30 per cent, are Protestant; 87, or 17·5 per cent, are Catholic; and 38, or 7·5 per cent, are Jewish. Analysis of the dates of establishment of these agencies shows that non-sectarian groups took the initiative earlier than the churches in organizing social service.

Public Agencies.

Private charity in service or in support is generally the expression of a sense of obligation of the charitable individual or group, even though that obligation cannot be enforced against him by contemporary society. But, in the course of history, we find that the isolated philanthropy of one generation became the organized charity of the next, and finally a public charge. This

[1] Individual agencies, 447; supplementary agencies, 47.

process of transfer from private voluntary effort to public, legislated responsibility is generally a gradual growth. In a democratic state, this process may be evaluated as the recognition by the entire community, or at least by a majority, of the usefulness and need of such types of service for the good of the community.

Since 1930, public expenditures for relief and other social welfare work have been increased enormously. The percentage change in public relief expenditures in Chicago from 1929 to 1935 was +3057. In 1929 private relief expenditure was 37·3 per cent of the total. But in 1935 it was only 1·7 per cent of the total. This does not mean that the amount of private relief expenditure has decreased appreciably. In 1929 it was $1,046,000, and in 1935 it was $943,000, showing a percentage decrease of only −9·9.

Since 1933, after the New Deal policy had been initiated, increased sharing of responsibility by the State in all areas of social welfare work has been the major trend.

> Something in the neighborhood of $105,000,000 was spent by private and public welfare agencies for services given to the dependent population of Cook County in 1935, and something in the neighborhood of $117,000,000 was spent by such agencies for services rendered to the general population including the dependent population..... At the present time, the amount of money that needs to be raised (either through taxes or through voluntary subscriptions to private agencies) for the Cook County area principally for the city of Chicago, is in the neighborhood of $120,000,000 a year or $144 a family in Chicago, and $113 a family in the Cook County area.[1]

But the expenditures in the succeeding years exceeded this estimate. In 1936 they were about $158,000,000, and in 1937, approximately $146,000,000. Expenditures of Public agencies alone, for social service in Cook County, amounted to $97,000,000 in 1935; $133,000,000 in 1936; and $118,000,000 in 1937.[2]

II

The Social Settlement Movement in Chicago

A functional classification of the 494 social service agencies listed in the *Social Service Directory* of Chicago for 1936 shows that 132, or 27 per cent, of them are classified as Group-Work agencies. The 362 remaining agencies are classified as follows: Family Service and Relief, 78; Care of Children, 102; Care of Aged, 45; Health Service Agencies, 107; and Protective Agencies, 30. Group-Work agencies include boarding homes for girls,

[1] Samuel A. Goldsmith, "Financing Social Work in Chicago," *Social Service Year Book, Chicago, 1935* (Chicago: Council of Social Agencies, 1935).

[2] *Social Service Year Book, Chicago, 1937*, pp. 102—3.

boys' and girls' work, neighborhood work, and social settlements. Sixty-four agencies are included in the first two classes, and 67 in the third. Of the latter 67, 10 are Catholic, 2 Jewish, 35 Protestant, and 20 non-sectarian.

Thus we find that 332 agencies are ameliorative in function; 30 are protective, safeguarding the proper social rights of individuals or groups against social discrimination; 64 are character building agencies which enlist members in clubs and organizations such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, etc., or provide residence facilities in boarding homes for girls; 67 are neighborhood houses and social settlements, which function as community-building agencies in the backward areas of the city wilderness. Of these, 35 are under Protestant auspices.

Eleemosynary or ameliorative services are gradually being taken over by the State in recent days. Protective services are rendered generally by the Civil Liberties Committee. The relation of the church as moral educational institutions to community-building activities, as envisaged in the social settlement movement, is vital. Moreover, Protestant churches in Chicago have evinced maximum interest in establishing neighborhood houses and social settlements. The history, development, and philosophy of the social settlement movement, therefore, is selected here for special analysis.

The history of the movement in Chicago falls into two periods. The first period begins in 1889, when Hull House—the first settlement in Chicago—was established by Miss Jane Addams; the second begins in 1910, since which date Protestant churches began to establish neighborhood houses in larger numbers.

Between 1889 and 1910, 43 neighborhood houses and social settlements were established in Chicago, of which 2 were Catholic and 3 Jewish. Of the remaining 38, 6 discontinued before 1910. Thus there were 32 non-Catholic, non-Jewish agencies functioning in Chicago in 1910; 13 of them were established before 1900, and 19 were established between 1900 and 1910. Twenty-two of these were established through the initiative of not more than two persons in each case, and 10 by a self-constituted board. Only 14 had any official connection with churches. But the sponsors of almost all of these agencies were active members of churches and relied mainly on the co-operation and financial support of their friends in the churches. Only 18 of these have survived to the present day, and 9 of them were sponsored by or under the auspices of churches: 1 Episcopal, 2 Methodist, 1 Congregational, 3 Presbyterian, and 2 Unitarian. The sponsors of the remaining 9 were: 1 Chicago Ethical Society, 2 Universities, 1 Jane Addams, 1 Dr. Graham Taylor, and 3 non-sectarian boards. One Episcopal, 1 Methodist, and 3 Presbyterian agencies still continue under denominational management, and the other 13 are classified today as non-sectarian.

Since 1910, 7 more settlements were established under nonsectarian auspices, and 30 more under denominational auspices. The denominational affiliations of these 30 are: 2 Episcopal, 5 Methodist, 4 Baptist, 4 Congregational, 10 Presbyterian, 3 Presbyterian Congregational, 1 Christ Reformed Church, 1 People's Community Church, 1 Salvation Army, 1 Volunteers of America, and 1 interdenominational. The numerical distribution shows that 17 of the total 35 are sponsored by Presbyterians and Congregationalists.

Location and Activities

Where and how do these agencies attempt to function as community-building agencies?

Location.—The ecological distribution of these agencies shows that they concentrate in three spatial areas. The highest concentration is in the "zone of transition" encircling the downtown area and in the zone of working men's homes. There is another group in the negro section, and the third group is in the South Chicago steel mill area.

> "The total effect of forces of city life, like mobility and promiscuity, upon the neighborhood and upon our traditional culture seems to be subversive and disorganizing. Particularly is this true of deteriorating areas, where neighborhood work originated, and where it is still, in any completely developed state, for the most part confined.....The zone of deterioration and the areas of the greatest mobility in the city have the greatest concentration of poverty, vice, crime, juvenile delinquency, divorce, desertion, abandoned infants, murder and suicide.[1]

In such places the experience of an Irish neighbor becomes common; as he said, "the longer one stays, the more of a stranger one becomes."

Analysis of the twenty community areas in which these agencies are located shows that in three of them the majority are Negroes, and in the others continental European or Irish immigrants of first and second generation. In none of these areas do we find more than 40 per cent of native whites of native parentage. The major nationality groups are German, Italian, Polish, Russian, Czechoslovakian, Lithuanian, and Irish.[2] The polyglot nature of the population, with all its economic and social handicaps, results in developing such unnatural conditions that

> .....it is almost impossible for neighborship to exist, or for the family even to survive. Racial antipathies array fellow immigrants against each other. Suspicions born of the ignor-

[1] Robert E. Park, E. W. Burgess, and R. D. McKenzie, *The City*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), pp. 50, 148.

[2] E. W. Burgess and Charles Newcombe (eds.), *Census Data of the City of Chicago, 1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), pp. 611 f.

ance of strangers' ways keep at arm's length, or bring only within striking distance, the native and foreign-born citizens of the same town.[1]

In short, neighborhood houses are located in areas where neighborliness, extended from these centers, serves those who seek comfort and direction. More than that, these agencies become the creative nucleus of a group consciousness in the neighborhood for social co-operation and group action.

Activities.—These agencies generally maintain day-nursery schools and kindergartens; clubs for boys, for girls, for young people, and for men and women, with social, civic, political, domestic, musical, athletic, dramatic, and co-operative interests; departments of household arts, manual training, and arts and crafts; gymnasium work for different age groups; music lessons; choruses for boys and for girls; lessons in English and citizenship for foreigners; concerts, movies, lectures, and forums; entertainments, plays, dances, festivals, and pageants. At many of these agencies, libraries and study rooms are provided. Health work, playgrounds, camps, and vacation houses are maintained by some. Outings and trips are conducted in summer. Personal service is rendered at the majority of these centers.

The social values of these activities are recognized both by the participants and by the residents alike. Clubs, for example, which are characteristic of almost all of the settlements, help in developing healthy social attitudes and co-operative spirit. "A clique, a club, a gang, a Fagin's household of thieves, the prisoners in jail," according to John Dewey, "provide educative environments for those who enter into their collective or conjoint activities as truly as a church, a labour union, a business partnership or a political party."[2]

The idealism behind the settlement movement and the intelligent approach to the problems by sponsoring programs have deserved much praise from all quarters. "Settlement work represents not only the most devoted and the most idealistic, but also the most intelligent, phase of social work of the past generation."[3]

Social investigation, efforts to better district conditions and to improve local institutions, general propaganda activities, and such other wider phases of community service are rendered by residents of some of the important agencies. Aside from the relative efficiency and exclusiveness of activities at different

[1] Graham Taylor, *Religion in Social Action* (New York: Dodd Mead and Co., 1913), p. 146.

[2] John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1926), p. 25.

[3] E. W. Burgess, "Can Neighborhood Work Have a Scientific Basis?" in Park, Burgess, and McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

centers, it may be judged that the activities are definitely conducive to the welfare of the communities in which these agencies are located.

Objectives

Statements of purpose made in respect to different social settlements and neighborhood houses may be compared to show the variations in objectives as well as the basic ideals behind the movement.

Hull House.—

The original two residents, as they then stated, believed that the mere foothold of a house easily accessible, ample in space, hospitable and tolerant in spirit, situated in the midst of the large foreign colonies which so easily isolated themselves in American cities, would be in itself a serviceable thing for Chicago.[1]

The subjective necessity which led to the opening of Hull Houses, as stated by Jane Addams was due to: "First, the desire to interpret democracy in social terms; secondly, the impulse beating at the very source of our lives, urging us to aid in the race progress; and thirdly, the Christian movement toward humanitarianism.[2]" When attempting to define a settlement, she said:

> The settlement, then, is an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city. It insists that these problems are not confined to any one portion of a city. It is an attempt to relieve, at the same time, the over-accumulation at one end of society and the destitution at the other; but it assumes that this over-accumulation and destitution are most sorely felt in the things that pertain to social and educational advantages. From its very nature it can stand for no political or social propaganda. It must, in a sense, give the warm welcome of an inn to all such propaganda, if perchance one of them be found an angel. The one thing to be dreaded in the settlement is that it loses its flexibility, its power of quick adaptation, its readiness to change its methods as its environment may demand. It must be open to conviction and must have a deep and abiding sense of tolerance. It must be hospitable and ready for experiment. It should demand from its residents a scientific patience in the accumulation of facts and the steady holding of their sympathies as one of the best instruments for that accumulation. It must be grounded in a philosophy which will not waver

[1] *Hull House Year Book*, 1910 (Chicago: The Hollister Press, 1910), p. 5.

[2] Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1910,), p 125.

when the race happens to be represented by a drunken woman or an idiot boy. Its residents must be emptied of all conceit of opinion and all self-assertion, and ready to arouse and interpret the public opinion of their neighborhood. They must be content to live quietly side by side with their neighbors, until they grow in to a sense of relationship and mutual interests. Their neighbors are held apart by differences of race and language which the residents can more easily overcome. They are bound to see the needs of their neighborhood as a whole, to furnish data for legislation, and to use their influence to secure it. In short, residents are pledged to devote themselves to the duties of good citizenship and to the arousing of the social energies which too largely lie dormant in every neighborhood given over to industrialism. They are bound to regard the entire life of their city as organic, to make an effort to unify it, and to protest against its over-differentiation. ....

The best speculative philosophy sets forth the solidarity of of the human race; that the highest moralists have taught that without the advance and improvement of the whole, no man can hope for any lasting improvement in his own moral or material individual condition; and that the subjective necessity for social settlements is, therefore, identical with that necessity, with urges us on toward social and individual salvation.[1]

Here is the expression of a faith in a philosophy that society as a whole should be saved in order to effect individual salvation, and that the individual is a part of a social organism.

The University of Chicago Settlement.—The aim and ideal of the University Settlement was stated by its head resident, Miss Mc Dowell, in the following words, entitled "The Young Citizen's Creed":

We believe that God hath made of one blood all nations of man, and that we are His children, brothers and sisters all. We are citizens of the United States, and believe our Flag stands for self-sacrifice for the good of all the people. We want to be true citizens of this our city, and therefore will show our love for her by our works. Chicago does not ask us to die for her welfare; she asks us to live for her good, so to live and so to act that her government may be pure, her officers honest, and every home within her boundaries be a place fit to grow the best kind of men and women to rule over her.[2]

In trying to reason out for herself the purpose of social settlements, Miss McDowell wrote:

[1] *Ibid-*, pp. 125-27.

[2] R. A. Woods and A. J. Kennedy, *Handbook of Social Settlements* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1911), p. 69.

Settlement residents do not go to people with a plan, a policy, or a proposition ; they go as friends, as neighbors with a keen sense of the commonness of all that is best in all. Theirs cannot be a handing down of culture or a going down to live with the poor. Real culture, as Mathew Arnold says, seeks to do away with classes ; to make the best that has been thought and known in the world current everywhere, to make all men live in an atmosphere of sweetness and light where they may use ideas as it uses them itself, freely nourished, not bound by them. This is the *Social* ideal, and men of culture are true apostles of equality.

Jane Addams says a social settlement is an effort toward social democracy. Robert Wood calls it an attitude of mind. Cannon Barnett says Toynbee Hall seems to be a center of education, a mission, a polytechnic school, another example of philanthropic machinery; it is really a clubhouse, and the residents are citizens doing citizens' duty, and the various activities have their root and life in the individuality of its members. Dean Hodges calls it a level bridge over a social chasm, perfectly level, not tipped at one end for the well-to-do and the learned to come down to the poor, but a level bridge where the ignorant rich and the ignorant poor, the learned and unlearned, can meet and know each other, each having something to give and something to receive. It is objective Christianity, says another. It is one of the many expressions of the social conscience that is slowly but surely feeling its way into action. It is the feeble but honest outward sign of an inner necessity urging the religious soul to find a way of making real the social ideal given by Jesus to the world. All of these definitions are unsatisfactory because they are trying to define life, friendship and human sympathy.— They either say too much or too little. [1]

Chicago Commons.—Dr. Graham Taylor, after forty years of work as Head Warden of Chicago Commons, writes :

Through these forty years or more, Chicago Commons has maintained and tried to apply a faith as essential alike to all religions and to any political or social democratic order. The faith of this spirit finds expression not in creed but in deed, not in ritual but in the sacraments of daily life ; not in the propaganda of any sect that must necessarily be divisive, but in the promotion of sentiments and interests held in common by all real faiths ; not in exclusive communions whose fellowships are to be cherished by individual adherents but by the all-inclusive community-consciousness to be extended to all mankind. There is without a social vision that visualizes such

[1]Quoted in Howard E. Wilson, *Mary McDowell, Neighbor* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 45-46.

far off events as though near enough to be gradually attainable. This imaginable social hope sustains patience to wait while we work with a faith that is the "substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen."[1]

The name "Chicago Commons" itself was chosen to represent the purpose and the ideal.

> We groped after some word which had at its root, if not in its form, that good old English word "common." Underlying this word and its many equivalents is the idea of sharing what each can be to all and what all can be to each, what belongs to no one person, or class, but to everyone and all the people. It is also the idea underlying the very conception of that community and communion in which society and religion alike consist, and which constitutes the essence of the social settlement motive and movement.[2]

Graham Taylor, like other pioneers in the field, was inspired by an unfaltering democratic faith in his fellow men, which stood undaunted and undimmed by any cynical default from democracy or any disclaimers of loyalty to social and religious ideals. The keynote of the whole adventure was expressed in a statement which appeared on his Christmas card of 1934:

> The good will to understand one another, to interpret misunderstood attitudes and situations, to reconcile and be reconciled to differences of taste and temperament, race and religion, heritage and aspirations, and through service and sacrifice to promote the unity of spirit is the bond of peace — this is the way toward the peace of God that passeth all understanding. Such is the meaning of our forty years here. Is it not now the hope for the best that is yet to be everywhere?[3]

It may be said that Graham Taylor showed Congregationalists in Chicago the way to "pioneer on social frontiers." Chicago Commons served as the normative example for other congregational agencies to follow. The "idea underlying the very conception of that community and communion in which society and religion alike consist" constituted the essence of the Chicago Commons and other Congregational neighborhood houses.

Presbyterian Neighborhood Houses.— The words of dedication used at the opening of the houses under the Church Extension Boards of the Chicago Presbytery describe their objective:

> This House is dedicated

[1] Graham Taylor, *Chicago Commons Through Forty Years* (Chicago: John F. Cuneo & Co., 1936), pp. 199—200.

[2] Graham Taylor, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), pp. 7—8.

[3] Quoted in the *Chicago Theological Seminary Register*, XXVIII, No. 4, 8.

To the glory of God and the service of men ;

To give strength to human bodies and cheer to human hearts ;

To give to strong men more strength, to graceful women more grace, and to little children more cheer ;

To interpret religion to minds that misunderstand ; to convey this message to ears that find it hard to hear ;

To bring the city nearer its Saviour and the Christ to the whole community.[1]

Howell Neighborhood House (Presbyterian). – Howell Neighborhood House is a place where people can practice the spirit of the Good Neighbor and share with each other the best they have.

It is not the works of a settlement that define it—it is the attitude of mind ; the enthusiasm for humanity that tells in the living with, not for people. It is this attitude of mind which is a basis for what we may call the philosophy of neighborliness.

We are all trying to find an answer to the question asked by King David : " Is it well with the child ? " – not only well clothed, well fed, not only well educated, not merely has he knowledge but has he wisdom ? Are the disciplines of life he experiences of a character to give him strength of purpose and sturdiness and virtue as a citizen and a neighbor ?[2]

Laird House (Presbyterian). – The attitude of the House religiously may well be expressed in Dr. Fox's words :

A Neighborhood House is not, and should not be a disguised " mission " in the commonly accepted sense of the term, but a real neighborhood house or community house ministering to all sorts of actual human needs, and to all sorts of people, regardless of their religious or church affiliation. Does not religion constitute an answer to a fundamental human need ? And therefore, if a community house is, among other things, a center for the discussion of all human problems, is its discussion complete if it does not make provision for intelligent and sane discussion of questions pertaining to religion ? .....[3]

In general, it may be said that Presbyterian neighborhood houses have as their objective service of the community rather than the individuals in the community. " To bring the city nearer its Saviour " thus means " saving " of the city from being anything less than what it ought to be in relation to its divine context. While condemning sectarian evangelism, they emphasize the religious aspects of community life.

[1] Howell Neighborhood House, *Annual Report*, 1937.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Dr. Paul Fox, " Laird House," *Chicago Daily News*, May 29, 1937

Methodist Episcopal Neighborhood Houses.— The evangelical zeal of the Methodists with a "Christocentric" religion and emphasis on personal ethics is evidenced in the objectives of neighborhood houses under their sponsorship. The story of the beginnings of Northwestern University Settlement may be cited as an example which reveals the attitude of the Methodists toward settlement work:

> Northwestern University Settlement, Chicago, was established in December, 1891, by Charles Zueblin. Upon his return from graduate studies at the University of Leipzig, Mr. Zueblin accepted an appointment under the Methodist City Mission, and was assigned to a locality of Scandinavians, Poles, and Germans. To understand their life and problems he took lodgings in the colony. His activities not being sufficiently evangelistic to meet the desires of his denominational backers, support was soon withdrawn. Influenced by what he had seen at Toynbee Hall and Hull House, Mr. Zueblin determined to found a settlement, and appealed to his Alma Mater, Northwestern University, for assistance.[1]

A typical statement of purpose of Methodist neighborhood houses is the one given for the Halsted Street Institutional Church Social Center:

> Founded October 1903, to develop and strengthen the work of the Church. The function of the institutional church is twofold. First, to do what every other church of its denomination does in the way of spiritual ministration,—to seek the conversion of its constituency and their union with the church. It has a more definite aim than the mere creation of a neighborhood atmosphere, for it seeks to get men definitely to acknowledge allegiance to Jesus Christ as Master. It generally works, however, in soil that is not fertile, and men, instead of expecting greater results than are realized in churches more fortunately placed, should expect a much smaller return. The second function of the institutional church is that of pure charity,—guileless investment for Christ's sake.
>
> An institutional church is a combination of church and settlement. It is a church socialized and a settlement evangelized. It does all that the church attempts in religious work, and all that the settlement seeks in the way of broad humanitarian charity, carrying on a gospel of evangelization and education, of spirit and of life. It aims to change not only the hearts but environment as well; it ministers not only to the soul but to the body also.[2]

[1]R. A. Woods and A. J. Kennedy, *The Settlement Horizon* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1922), p. 48.

[2]Woods and Kennedy, *Handbook of Settlements*, p. 77.

Marcy Center.—New Marcy Center, located in an area where almost 95 per cent of the people are Jewish, operates more or less on the same principle. "The greatest present day need, of course, is Christ, and our opportunity is to present Him to them" is the opinion of the superintendent of this agency. The charges often made that neighborhood houses operated by churches are city missions for evangelistic and proselytizing purposes may be accepted as legitimate under such circumstances.

Evangelism, development of personal character, and humanitarianism as a "guileless investment for Christ's sake" are mainly emphasized in the Methodist neighborhood houses.

Conclusion

Correlated with the specialized interests of different denominations in different functional fields of social work, we find also variations in emphasis within the same functional field. In line with the traditional outlook of different denominations, different neighborhood houses carry on similar activitis, but with varying emphasis. Opportunity for evangelism is appreciated in some. In others, the necessity of relating the community to the Divine will is recognized as a compelling duty, and hence emphasis is laid on "social redemption."

III

The Coming of the Social Settlement Idea

Social settlements began to be established in Chicago only by the last decade of the last century. The settlement movement had its inception originally in England. The idea was welcomed and adapted to the American scene. The social forces that necessitated such a movement need to be examined in order to understand the significance of the movement. The types of agencies that were established earlier, before the coming of the social settlement idea, are to be examined. An examination of the attitude of the Protestant churches at different periods toward the settlement movement is also necessary to undrerstand the story of the movement in Chicago.

> Nature is rich; but everywhere man, the heir of nature, is poor. Never in this happy country or elsewhere has there been enough of anything for the people. Never have all the sons and daughters of men been warm, filled, shod and roofed.[1]

This was the first paragraph of a book that was written in 1894, "in agony and depression of spirit," to expose the business

[1] Henry Demarest Lloyd, *Wealth against Commonwealth* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1894), p. 1.

ethics of the Standard Oil Company and other monopolies in the United States. The corruption in "high places" and the sensitivity to social injustice in the hearts of isolated individuals here and there, were both characteristic of the last two decades of the last century.

The land of the pioneers, in the age of "Big Business," had become the hunting ground of industrial magnates. The years between 1880 and 1890 showed all the marks of the modern economic order. Concentration of capital and industrial management, increase in the number of employed and increased demand for cheap labor, the influx of new immigrants of a different racial character and their congestion in newly developing cities, and the growth of slums in city areas brought in their trail problems which America had not faced before. Between 1880 and 1900, nine million immigrants came to America—i.e., as many as had come in a period of sixty years before 1880. The problem of cultural assimilation and Americanization had become more acute than it was in regard to the earlier immigrants. The recurrent conflict between capital and labor confronted American thinkers with greater poignancy. The cleavage between the rich and the poor, the privileged and the underprivileged, was becoming wider and wider. The land of opportunity, where the hard-working honest man had vast unclaimed areas of land and natural resources to exploit and gain economic security and social well-being had become a land of speculators and monopolists who exploited the economic poverty of the vast mass of laborers to their own advantage. "Getting rich quick" was interpreted as a mark of "smartness" rather than cupidity and lack of social consciousness. Industrialism, with its mechanized machinery, produced a steely hardiness in the social attitude of the industrial magnates, with the consequence that impersonality in social relations within the industrial groups became almost an accepted phenomenon in modern social life. It was inevitable that such a baffling situation, which changed the American scene so rapidly and thoroughly, should soon express itself in disturbing ways. The rise of industrialism manifested itself in the cities by a progressively low standard of living, congestion of families in tenements, and crowding of houses, on land, unemployment, nesting of vice near the homes of those least able to protect themselves, widespread misery recurring like an epidemic after every trade depression, and the increasing isolation of well-to-do and poor from each other. Individuals and groups sensitive to the social consequences of such a situation began to mould public opinion in a way that they thought would save much of human waste and social degeneration.

One of them, having acquainted himself with all available facts regarding the business practices of "the most ingenious of the *condottieri* of the monopoly," quickened by a sense of impending peril, and uplifted by the conviction of an inevitable

mission, began to "tell the American people," especially "the men and women who do the work of the world." He wrote to a friend:

> The real truth about the Standard Oil people is that they are thieves; the trouble is that neither they nor the people generally realise this. In the early days good men.....could be pirates and the men could applaud them. The moral sense has differentiated until at last it could see clearly and taught that this piracy of Sir Francis Drake's was wicked. The task of today is to lay bare the realities of the Standard Oil methods, and the evils of the results so clearly that the public will all be driven, irresistibly, to see and confess that modern business is still piracy and theft and lying. There was a time when it was not murder to kill an enemy; when it was not theft to steal that which belonged to someone of another tribe; when breach of trust was unknown, because trust had not been conceived of; when it was not a lie to tell untruths to strangers. The men who first as moral pioneers declared that all these were simply, clearly, and sharply, murder, theft, and lying were, as Goethe says must happen to all true reformers, burned or hanged in their day, but have become prophets, and are now revered. As troublesome no boubt will be the pathway of those who declare and prove that the methods of modern business, as exemplified in the careers of its most brilliantly successful practitioners, are those still of lying, theft, murder, having other gods than the true God. But all this must be said and proved and believed, before this wicked and adulterous generation can be got to give up its evil practices.[1]

Henry D. Lloyd was the first "muckraker" in America. In an article published in the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1881, entitled "The Story of a Monopoly," he exposed the evils of the business ethics of the day. In 1883, in an editorial upon Arnold Toynbee's work in London, he wrote, under the caption "A New Magna Charta":

> In England, as here, the prophetic instinct of the people foresees that the emergencies of the near future ought to be, not of religious liberty as in the time of the Reformation, nor of political liberty, as in the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century, and the French and American Revolutions of the next century, but of Industrial liberty. A ferment can be seen at work, by even careless observers of public opinion, in the minds of the people, that is bringing up the old question of the rights of the many in a new form. That the fruits of human labor are unfairly divided and that the strong oppress the weak is an old, old story, but what is new is that the masses can perhaps by acting together alleviate these wrongs in the

[1] Caro Lloyd, *Henry Demarest Lloyd, 1847—1903: A Biography* (2 vols., New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912), I, 184.

world of capital and labor as in the reformation of the past they have done in the worlds of politics and the church..... But how to do it is the question to which those who were born to hate wrong are turning above every other.....Great changes are impending. New ideas, nebulous yet, will take clearer shape as they pass through the fires of one indignant mind after another. It will not continue forever that the earth —which is the Lord's and the fullness thereof—shall be turned by whole countries into aristocratic turf under the feet of starving British peasants, or that the population of democratic and republican America shall be feudalized into industrial barons by the hundred and serfs by the million. But the formulas on which this reformation will move have not been thought out. When they are revealed the unnatural principles of the competitive economy of John Stuart Mill will be as absolute as the rules of war by which Caesar slaughtered the fair-haired men, women and children of Germania on the banks of the Rhine and the Meuse.[1]

As Jane Addams said in her memorial address:

.....throughout his life Mr. Lloyd believed in and worked for the "organization of labor," but with his whole heart he longed for what he called "the religion of labor," whose mission it should be "to advance the Kingdom of God into the unevangelized territory of trade, commerce and industry." He dared to hope that "out of the pain, poverty and want of the old people there may at last be shaped a new loving cup for the old religion.[2]

The acute awareness of the social problems arising out of capitalism, and the sensitivity to the same characteristic of that period among the social thinkers and moral leaders, are reflected in the life and works of Henry D. Lloyd. Moreover, mention of Lloyd's work is pertinent here because the abuses he exposed were those of a philanthropist who gave freely and extensively as no man ever gave.

Of the extent of his giving only estimates can be made; he may have given away as much as a billion dollars. Certainly he gave as no man ever gave before. This trait in his character, it needs be remembered, was not developed, Carnegie-fashion, as a luxury of his old age. He had it from the start. As a clerk in a Cleveland store, living on a salary of $50 a month, he began giving a tenth of his income away. Proportionately, he was more generous as a young man than as a man of millions.....As regards his personal conduct, he was the

[1] *Chicago Tribune*, February 12, 1883.

[2] *In Memoriam*, Henry Demarest Lloyd; May 1st, 1847—September 28, 1903. The Auditorium, Chicago, November 29, 1903 (Chicago: Thomas P. Halperin and Co., 1903).

personification of the virtues which the America of that time exalted. A devout Churchman, a devoted husband and father, a generous giver to all manner of philanthropic and reform causes.....[1]

Interpretation of his responsibilities as a "steward of vast wealth" had, as a famous cartoonist showed, certainly built up the "credit side" of his life's ledger to exceed that of any multi-millionaire during the recent era of vast fortunes.

But philanthrophy was not enough. "Solidarity of the human race" was not to be promoted by the crumbs that fell under the table of "Lady Bountiful." The gulf between the rich and the poor had to be bridged by understanding and good will toward each other. The social problems arising out of the growth of industrial capitalism were to be solved by social prophets.

As in England, in America also the problems of youth in the city were met by organizing the Y. M. C. A. Originally an inter-denominational evangelistic organization, it served to bring together isolated individuals to a common meeting place for prayer and worship. It also brought the laity of Protestant churches into active leadership. Particularly was it influential in bringing together divisive sectarian Protestant groups into co-operative activity and fellowship. Later, after the revitalization of the Y. M. C. A. movement by introducing the fourfold program after the Civil War, it continued successfully to influence the young men in urban areas of America. Interdenominationalism, shift of emphasis from dogma to life, and the creation of Christian character in young men became the contribution and the objective of the Y. M. C. A. Yet it was mainly centered around the individual as an entity removed from the environment. Y. M. C. A. centers served as healthy social centers to which individuals from demoralizing urban areas could resort. The membership was mainly drawn from the commercial class and not the working class of people. At its best it was a "city mission" ministering to the "spiritual, intellectual, social and physical needs" of young men in the city.

But the individual's character was not to be successfully regenerated in isolation from his community. A new institution had to be run to include in its program activities that were planned in terms of the needs and well being of the whole community.

Religious, ethical and educational leaders in America began to think on a wider scale in terms of social and economic justice. The social gospel movement among the liberal Protestants began to capture the imagination and sensitize the conscience of such of those to whom the Kingdom of God meant an attainable

[1] Editorial, "Mr. Rockefeller," *The Christian Century*, June 2, 1937, p. 703.

ideal community on earth. The humanizing influence of higher education had its effect on the educated youth to look upon society as a moral organism. The recognition of the dignity of every man as a person and the interdependence of one individual on the other for mutual support and common well-being led to the emphasis of social obligations rather than individual rights. Humanitarian kindness of the "Lady Bountiful" was not accepted as a substitute for social justice. Amidst this rising tide of resentment and conflict, there was to be a temporizing, reconciling group or agency to bridge the gulf.

> In America, Abraham Lincoln, by liberating both freemen and slaves, had done what William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips had agitated, what Theodore Parker and William Ellery Channing had preached, what James Russell Lowell had sung in and laughed out, what Ralp Waldo Emerson had reasoned away, and what Harriet Beecher Stowe did to make emancipation from slavery and other orthodoxies imperative. In neither land [America and Great Britain], however, had the settlement pioneers any immediate predecessors in moving in between dividing class, racial, partisan and sectarian lines for a ministry of understanding, interpretation, and unification.[1]

The social settlement movement in America, in general, thus had its origin and growth with the objective of moving in between dividing lines of society for a ministry of understanding, interpretation, and unification.

An examination of the pronounced statements of purpose by the leaders of this movement show, on the whole, a unanimity on the essentials, with emphasis on different aspects according as the cirumstances and situations demanded. Speaking of Toynbee and Oxford Halls in London, and of the Neighborhood Guild in New York (the first social settlement in America, founded in 1887; later recognized as the University Settlement Society), the first report issued in 1891 said: "In all three institutions the ends might have been much the same, viz., the cultivation of friendly relations between the educated and uneducated, and the gradual uplifting of the latter by the better influences thus brought to bear upon them."[2] The object laid down in the constitution was:

> . . . . . to bring men and women of education into closer relations with the laboring classes in this city for their mutual benefit. The Society shall establish and maintain in the tenement house districts places of residence for college men, and others desirous of aiding in the work, with rooms in the neighborhood where people may meet for social and educational purposes.[3]

[1] Taylor, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers,* pp. 278—79.

[2] Quoted in Arthur C. Holden, *The Settlement Horizon* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1922), p. 15.

[3] Stuart A. Queen, *Social Work in the Light of History* (Philadelphia: J. B Lippincott Co., 1922), p. 134.

Even though there was a tone of condescension as of uplifting and sharing, subsequent developments have shown that most of the well-organized settlements have been established with high idealism of democracy and respect for the common man, irrespective of his economic or social status. Unaffected human intercourse and outreaching mutual aid in a spirit of good will and fellowship became the characteristic ideal of American settlements

The significance of settlement work in the educational process was early recognized by the leading universities in the country. Soon after the University of Chicago Settlement was established, the following statement was published in the *University Register:*

> A settlement is a body of educated people living in a neighborhood for the purpose of co-operation in social work and for learning the concrete facts of life at first hand. There are vast accumulations of knowledge lying dead because they are not communicated. The world of culture is closed to hundreds of thousands from want of mediators. The existence of multitudes of honest people is intellectually and aesthetically barren because they are cut off from the fountains of intelligence. On the other hand, the lives of cultivated people are frequently narrow, undignified, useless, and false from exclusiveness. Great poets, novelists, statesmen, preachers, have always known mankind in many aspects. The student of politics, economics, and social philosophy can avoid provincial, individualistic, and class prejudices, only by mingling with people of varied experiences. Our political life is on the basis of equality. Our economic, intellectual and spiritual life is not democratic. The whole organic activity must be pervaded by one spirit or our civilization is in constant peril. If ignorance and rudeness control the ballot, culture is insecure. In all communities there are some aspiring souls. The settlement aims to discover these and help them in moral leadership. The residents aim to promote every effort at local amelioration—economic, domestic, educational, social, moral, political and religious. They do not introduce a foreign institution, but fertilize and cultivate the springing elements of good already found in the neighborhood. As the means of the students who give their services are limited, the provision for expenses needs to be supplied from other sources, and philanthropy can find no wiser channel of beneficence.[1]

In a letter to the President of the Board of Directors of the Settlement, President Harper of the University wrote:

> The Settlement itself seems to me to be one of the most important institutions connected with the University, and any

[1] *University Register*, July 1893—July 1894. University of Chicago Settlement.

hindrance to the work will be throughout the University. Officially and personally I regard the setrlement as a vital part of the University work.[1]

The recognition of the Settlement as a vital part of the University, and the purpose as mentioned above, indicate a basic principle of higher education in America—viz., education for life with a purposive direction of consecration for the service of the good of the community. Education was to equip students for community service, and the Settlement was the institution which formed the channel of expression of this spirit.

Social justice, true citizenship, democratic ideals of working *with* people of all grades and status, and the earthly interpretation and vision of a heavenly kingdom, became the ideals and watchwords of most of the settlements. A religious attitude towards life rather than faith in a religious creed became the criterion of effective Christianity.

Both in number and scope the settlement movement expanded more in America than in Great Britain. By about 1924 there were only 50 settlements in Great Britain, as against 400 in America.[2] In 1910, as listed in the Handbook of Settlements,[3] there were only 4 settlements in Canada, 46 in England—34 of these in London alone—and 8 in Scotland.

> Although getting its specific clue from England, the American settlement was compounded of qualities and sentiments distinctively of the soil. The first of these was religious, freed of intellectual fetters and focused on character and service. Then came closely related aspirations toward unaffected human intercourse and outreaching mutual aid. Next, ardor for the pursuit and dissemination of the results of higher education. Finally, faith in American political principles and assurance that their thorough-going application would bring a higher and better order of society. These convictions enveloped the undertaking like a luminous atmosphere.[4]

The recognition of the dignity of human nature, irrespective of social status, made the settlement pioneers consider it a privilege to have the opportunity of cultivating respectful familiarity with the working-class people. In spite of this religious devotion and new dedication to a life of service and a mission of good will, organized religion looked upon this movement with skepticism if not with derisive contempt.

[1] *Minutes Book*, University of Chicago Settlement, Board Meeting of February 12, 1896.

[2] Cf. Francis H. Stead, *The Story of Social Christianity* (2 vols.; New York: Geo. H. Doran Co., 1924), II, 215.

[3] Woods and Kennedy, *Handbook of Settlements*, pp. 305-8.

[4] Woods and Kennedy, *The Settlement Horizon*, pp. 55-56.

In the midst of all their new ethical problems and aims, early residents had the staunch and unqualified support of many progressive leaders in different branches of the church. They were compelled, however, to endure the cold aloofness if not the outright opposition of representatives of the greater majority of religious people. In season and out of season they were met by eager evangelicals with the imputation of disloyalty to denominational standards. Somewhat scornfully their enterprise was referred to as a "philanthropic picnic in a wilderness of sin." At best, they were charged with overemphasizing the incidental plans of the Christian life to the neglect of its higher, more decisive appeals.[1]

But the ideal behind the movement was that instead of plucking brands from the burning, it was better to put out the fire. Instead of seeking to lead a scattered few to righteousness, they were striving toward a more abundant life for all. Belief in the democratic principle of self-help in terms of communities rather than as individuals was the cornerstone of the American settlement movement.

In the twenty-third annual meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, when speaking about settlement work in America, Julia C. Lathrop said:

> We are turning from those subjects which drew this conference together, leaving the painful and almost disheartening question of the care and prevention of abnormalities of mind or of body or of both, to follow the great normal trend of human progress and the efforts of those who are trying to aid universal development at points where it is most halting.
>
> .....the settlement asks earnestly, what are the crucial questions of the day? Nor does it hesitate to answer that on the material side they are the industrial and economic questions upon which social questions so largely hinge. On the moral side it is the question of an enlargement of our notion of personal responsibility, a quickening of the sense of social interdependence. If individual good will is out-dated because it is unscientific, it is again outworn because its scope is inadequate. .....Considered upon American soil, the settlement may be regarded as a humble but sincere effort toward a realization of that ideal of social democracy in whose image this country was founded, but adapted and translated into the life of today.[2]

These idealists recognized that unaffected social intercourse between classes was the means to weld together people in a social democracy. It was a new dedication of life to demolish the artificial barriers of race, color, class and creed, and the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[2] Julia C. Lathrop, "What Settlement Work Stands For," *Report of the Conference of Charities and Correction*. 1896, ed. Isabel C. Barrows (Boston: Geo. H. Ellis, 1896), pp. 109-10.

utilization of the educational and economic privileges the few had in the service of those who did not have a chance to get them. Neighborliness was the creed and democracy was the aim in the philosophy of the early social settlements.

All the definitions made in the early era agreed in taking residence in the district of the neighborhood where work is undertaken an essential condition. As Miss Helena S. Dudley, of Denison House, Boston, defined it:

> A group of educated men or women (or both) living among manual workers, in a neighborly and social spirit. Organized work is not essential, but is a convenient method of getting acquainted with people. Nothing is essential except residence and a spirit of brotherhood, expressed actively.[1]

The general title of the topic discussed in the conference, in a separate session set apart for the discussion of settlement workers, was: "Social Settlements and the Labor Question."[2] This indicates that the main emphasis was on labor problems in the modern industrial centers of America.

The impressive growth in the number of settlements in America shows the vitality of the movement. "There were 74 American settlements listed in 1897; 103 in 1900; 204 in 1905. In this Handbook the number is 413."[2]

> According to the White House Conference, there are about 450 settlements in the country at the present time. Of these, about 250 are conducted under religious auspices, the remainder under non-sectarian control.[3]

Outgrowth and Allies of the Settlements

The organization of the National Federation of Settlements influenced the formation of the Playground and Recreation Association of America, War Camp Community Service, and Community Service, Incorporated. The settlement movement and university extension service were mutually influential both in England and America; the development of the public school as a social center was definitely an outgrowth of the former. The establishment of small parks and field houses by various park commissioners in Chicago was due to the influence of the settlement movement. The park commissioners, explaining why they gave field houses to the people, said: "It is simply the social settlement idea applied to parks."[4]

[1] *Ibid*, p. 167.

[2] Woods and Kennedy, ***Handbook of Settlements,*** p. vi.

[3] George B. Mangold, *Organization of Social Welfare* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1934), p. 280.

[4] Mary McDowell, "The Field Houses of Chicago and Their Possibilities," *Charities and the Commons*, XVIII (New York: The Charity Organization Society, 1907), 538.

The latest outgrowth of the movement which was long represented by the settlement alone is the social unit experiment in Cincinnati. In 1916, there was founded the National Social Unit Organization, whose purpose was stated to be: To promote a type of democratic community organization through which the citizenship as a whole can participate directly in the control of community affairs, while at the same time making constant use of the highest technical skill available.[1]

In the settlement movement and allied works, we notice certain changes in trends in the field of social service. The main feature was a shift in emphasis from the individual to the community, and an extension of fields of activities.

There has been a gradual decrease of benevolent uplift and a gradual increase of neighborhood organization or self-expression. There is less philanthropy to disadvantaged neighborhoods and more arousal of whole communities to their common tasks. Through it all, we see the slow growth of professional service in the employ of democratically organized groups.[2]

IV

The Church and the Social Settlement Movement in America

Any institution that does not "lose itself to save its life" generally tends to be conservative rather than creative. Organized religion is no exception to this rule. A church which tries to save itself and exist for its own sake loses its vital relation to society as a moral leavening force. Any new innovation is looked upon in such a situation as "second-grade religion" or "secularization." The reaction of the churches in general toward the Y. M. C. A. during its period of transition was like that. The same attitude was shown when the early poineers started out to save communities instead of "saving souls." The majority of the conservative churches looked upon the social settlement movement as "a philanthropic picnic into a wilderness of sin." The non-sectarian sponsorship of many of the early social settlements was due mainly to the unfavourable reaction of conservative evangelistic churches in general, toward the new enterprise.

But conditions were changing both outside and inside the churches. The social changes incidental to the growth of cities forced the churches to adapt themselves to the new conditions. The social gospel movement had begun to interpret the gospel of

[1]Queen, *op. cit.*, p. 140.
[2]*Ibid.*, p. 143.

salvation in terms of society rather than individuals. Adaptation to the environmental changes of old churches took the form of organizing institutional churches.

> The development of this particular type of activity was forced upon the church by changed neighborhood conditions. It was the movement of population incident to the growth of the modern city that presented this new problem. The normally Protestant church-going population moved out into the newer sections, leaving behind the church building surrounded by residents not hitherto considered its people, who found in the church no appeal that should cause them to be interested in its activities. In earlier days these people were English-speaking, but generally of the working-class whom the church had up to this time largely left out of consideration. In later years there have been foreign-speaking groups of varied racial elements and of almost any religious faith or none, although most generally of Roman Catholic or Jewish tradition. The Church has had to choose between two courses—to sell out and follow its former members into the newer residence section, or to stay and adapt its program to the new situation, to build again the life of the church out of the new elements at hand. In this way has arisen the institutional church, which in many instances is being called the community service church.[1]

Thus, at first, this type of church arose by the yielding of the church to pressure in the struggle for its very existence, in its endeavor to retain its foothold in the locality in which in other days it had a right of way. Making a virtue of necessity, the church addressed itself to the new task. With reluctance on the part of the older constituency that remained, yet with a gradually dawning consciousness that the church must do the obvious thing or die, the change in program was brought about. But it was only after the settlements had proved the religious aspects of community service as an end in itself that the churches also realized the significance of an expanded program. The traditional form of service to the spiritual needs alone was not sufficient for the age. The development of Christian neighborhood houses was the answer to the new situation. "The Christian Neighborhood House in its method of approach to the community, its lines of development as to program, and its relation to the type of building desired, has adapted the social settlement idea rather than that of the conventional type church."[2]

Neighborhood houses sponsored by the churches began to define themselves as taking a middle road between the traditional

[1] W. Clyde Smith, "The Aim and Purpose of the Neighborhood House," *Proceedings* of the Conferences of Neighborhood House Work held at Harkness Camp, Willoughby, Ohio, June 10-12, 1925 (New York: Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., 1925), pp. 22-23.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

church which disregarded all needs except the spiritual, and the new and non-sectarian social settlements with pure humanitarianism recognizing all needs except the spiritual. The aim was to demonstrate the power and beauty of practical Christianity. As illustrated in the remark of a Russian girl that America and Christian America are very different, the Christian neighborhood houses were endeavoring to interpret Christian America to the neighborhood, and the neighborhood to Christian America.

In a conference at Union Seminary held in 1922, the following definition of a Christian neighborhood house was adopted:

> A Christian Neighborhood House is an unconventional interpretation of the Christian ideal and purpose, its program being freely developed in response to the immediate human, social and religious needs of the neighborhood. It aims at a full rounded Christian ministry to all departments of life, including provision in the neighborhood for a fellowship of Christian believers, a Christian church, when such a church grows out of a naturally felt need.[1]

Thus neighborhood houses were recognized as useful by their own right and practical community service was to be as much Christian as the traditional spiritual service of saving souls. The stigma of being labelled as Christian missions rather than social service centers was gradually removed. In the preface of the *Handbook of Social Settlements*, edited by the late Dr. R. A. Woods and Mrs. A. J. Kennedy and published in 1911, the following statement is made in defining a social settlement:

> The typical settlement under American conditions is one which provides central territory traversing all the lines of racial and religious cleavage. The house which is wholly unsectarian not only proves the point of view of the staff, but as judged by the main actions of the kind of social enterprise here set forth. Nevertheless, it is clear that there is a considerable number of houses having a high degree of the settlement spirit, which includes more of the functions distinctive of a particular smaller or larger division of the church. Where such specific religious effort is conducted without willing or conscious invasion of other religious loyalties, it has not been construed as carrying the house in question beyond the distinctive limits of the settlement field.[2]

There was thus mutual recognition on the part of the church in its indebtedness to the social settlement movement, and on the part of the latter in the recognition of the Christian neighborhood houses as not merely "city missions" interested in increasing church membership, but actual "community-building" agencies.

[1] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 24.

[2] Woods and Kennedy, *Handbook of Settlements*, p. v.

The emphasis on social Christianity resulted in various forms of activity. In 1893, a "Brotherhood of the Kingdom" was formed, defining the social task of the church. In 1907 appeared Walter Rauschenbusch's challenging book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. In 1908 the Methodist-Episcopal Church (North) made a formulated declaration of social ideals and standards. "The Social Creed of the Churches" was adopted and issued in 1912 by the Federal Council of Churches in America. There was an "epidemic of declarations" of social creeds in many churches. The nation-wide "Men and Religions Movement" of 1911—1912 set blazing before the churches the task of rendering "social service" instead of concentrating on the formalities and fervors of an individualistic pietism.

Social gospel seemed to have such influence and acceptance that it had "made social Christianity orthodox."[1] During and immediately after the War there had been created on all sides an "enthralling idealism." America had engaged in a "war to end war" and to "make the world safe for Democracy." The self-imposed duty of assuming moral and spiritual leadership of the world expressed itself in the "Inter Church World Movement" which was organized in 1919.

By 1920, however, after the victory of the political party opposed to the League of Nations, there was a violent reaction from internationalism to nationalism.

> One of the characteristics of this period was the multiplication of organizations devoted to the creation of a larger loyalty to local communities and national enterprises..... Business men boosted local enterprises, did much good work for local charities, and supported boys' and girls' clubs.[2]

The unprecedented economic prosperity of the post-war decade lulled the prophetic cry for social justice. Increased amounts of gifts to churches and charity turned the tide of social reconstruction into benevolent philanthropy. Financial dependence of churches on the wealthy made the churches more moderate in their tone. Thus by the middle of the last decade the "social gospel" became less absolute in its denunciations and affirmations, less hopeful of the immediate realization of its ideals, and on the whole less aggressive in its attitude.

> In spite of all that is said, there are not many martyrdoms of the prophets in the American Church. . . . . Perhaps the Church in America has been engulfed by the general mood of reaction which seems to have fastened itself upon the nation as a result of unprecedented prosperity. It is not easy to speak for justice when injustice is not obvious. . . . . Further-

[1] Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1919), p. 20.

[2] Sweet, *op. cit.* p. 384.

more, there is "the tyranny of the pew over the pulpit," the limitation of freedom of preaching caused by financial dependence of the local church on the moneyed classes of the community.[1]

The ultimate effect was that throughout America, there was more activity in the field of "social service" and less demand for a thorough social reconstruction. Evolutionary ways of reform instead of revolutionary and radical reconstruction of the social order on the basis of social justice were realized to be "safer." The churches played "safe" and the wealthy contributed liberally for social service. The seeds of social gospel took roots and grew according as the nature of the soil on which they fell varied. Along with the increased interest in social service came also increased appreciation of neighborhood work. Consequently numerous neighborhood houses were established.

Now in spite of the general similarity in name and activities of the many neighborhood houses and social settlements, the very fact that many of them have different origins and sponsorship makes them varied in their emphasis and purpose.

There are others which have both the religious and secular programs as an expression of practical Christianity. Here "religious" and "secular" are not differentiated as competing or contradictory, but as complementary to each other. As in the case of the "four-fold" program of the Y. M. C. A., these neighborhood houses are having a full rounded program of activities, all of them considered as sacred to the cause of personality development and community building.

There is another group, which is not formally connected with any particular denomination or other religious organization, but has a distinctively marked qualitative religious atmosphere permeating the whole institution. Mainly as a legacy of their respective founders and as an active interpretation of creative religion, these institutions not only render the normal practical service, but stand out as settlements par excellence. These institutions are the very antithesis of the medieval monasteries, even though social service is common to both. In contrast to the monasteries, instead of retreat from the actual world in despair of ever saving it, religious life is interpreted here as the leaven that transforms society and that if ever religion is worth saving, it must be instrumental to save the world. In short, the dynamic force behind this type of settlements is a creative religious faith that functions to arouse moral discontent with the contemporary social order and expresses itself in creative activity toward a better standard of justice, good will, and love. The idealism of these pioneers and their vision of the utility of such work may be gleaned from the titles of their expositions in literature on

[1] *Christian Century*, July 15, 1926, p. 888.

settlements. To quote only a few: "The Settlement as a Social Laboratory" (1877); "The World as a Subject of Redemption" (1885); "Neighborhood Guilds: An Instrument of Social Reform" (1891); "Americanization as a Settlement Sees It" (1891); "Democracy and Charity" (1895); "Social Settlements and the Civic Service" (1898); "Ethical Democracy" (1900); "Americans in Process" (1902); "Battle with the Slum" (1902); "Leaven in a Great City" (1902); "As an Alien Feels: America Dawned for Me in a Social Settlement" (1905); "Knight-Errant of the Intellectual Life" (1905); "Hope for the City" (1906); "Banners of a New Army" (1912); "Playing at Citizenship" (1913); "Neighborhood in Social Reconstruction" (1914); "Settlement Work as a Preparation for Civic Work" (1916); "The Regeneration of the Free" (1918); "Education through Settlement" (1920); "The Neighborhood in Nation Building" (1922).[1] These titles indicate both the evolution and the range of vision of the settlement idea. "Group-work" agencies in general aim at the development of those social attitudes which will contribute to the ideal community as each sponsoring group visualizes.

As Grace L. Coyle stated in her paper on "Group Work and Social Change":

> Group work is a part of the educational process by which society aims to produce certain effects in individuals and to preserve and transform its cultural heritage. [As to the purpose of group work, she says:] . . . . Some aim at the growth and adjustment of the individual. But like all education it cannot avoid also a social responsibility for the making of citizens—i. e., for the production in individuals of those attitudes and accomplishments which will contribute to the kind of society we desire.[2]

The test of success is the contribution it makes to the vital changes that are remaking our society. The three major aspects of potential contribution of group work to social change, as mentioned by Miss Coyle, are:

1. The experience in collective living afforded by the group-work agency.
2. The social function of the so-called cultural activities of the group-work agency.
3. The place and function of direct education on social questions and social action towards citizenship training.

[1] Woods and Kennedy, The *Settlement Horizon*. Bibliography pp. 447—472.

[2] J. E. Kirkpatrick, *The American College and Its Rulers* (New York: New Republic, Inc., 1926), p. 30.

V

Community Control of Organized Community Service in Chicago

An eminent educationist recently remarked that one of the tasks of the last generation was to extricate education from the control of the Church. The situation today, as he sees it, seems to indicate that the task of education for the next generation will be to extricate itself from the control of the State. The fate of educational institutions in the totalitarian states bear eloquent testimony to the truth of this statement. Even though the threat of totalitarianism may not be so immediate, the status of many educational institutions in America today shows that academic freedom is very much limited. According to Kirkpatrick, they had long ago lost the right of self-government.

> Self-government for the college in America ceased with the winning of that right for the colonies. In this crisis the American lay governor of the College was born. So also was his agent, the president, and his servant the professor.[1]

What is the result? Has it affected education adversely? Dean Henry M. Bates, of the Michigan University Law School, reporting to the American Association of University Professors, as Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, said:

> The cases in which there is open and clear interference with freedom of speech will be few. The more baffling cases are those in which a steady and powerful, but almost invisible and impalpable pressure of an academic hierarchy suppresses, discourages and seriously interferes with the usefulness and development of the independent and original thinker.[2]

The struggle for academic freedom—freedom to seek Truth which alone shall make one free—is even today a live issue.[3] Whether it is the Church or the State or the "Sky-scraper" that controls educational institutions, the tendency is to control and subjugate them for their own respective interests. In other words, education is to be made "safe" for religion, or for the State, or for the financier.

There is abundant evidence to show that what is true of education is also true of social work. There is even a close parallelism in the history, development, and present status of both.

Social work also faced the problem of extricating itself from the control of the Church, which was largely responsible for its

[1] J. E. Kirkpatrick, *The American College and Its Rulers* (New York: New Republic, Inc., 1926); p. 30.

[2] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 105.

[3] Robert M. Hutchins, *No Friendly Voice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936)

origin. Even today, when a church board insists on denominational identity rather than professional efficiency of a social worker who is to take charge of a " children's home " under its auspices, the struggle for freedom seems to have been legitimate. The abuses and restrictions prevalent in social service agencies under the control of certain churches are none too flattering. Fasting may be good for the soul, but when it is imposed on the residents of a maternity home which passes off as a social service agency, criticism against sectarian agencies may be accepted as valid.

But there are abundant evidences to show that social work has to concern itself about freedom from other forms of control. The State is only one of these possible kinds of control. " Politics in Relief " is the prostitution of human needs. Social work done by private agencies, when controlled by the wealthy contributors for the preservation of their own class interests, is on the same level with that of the dogs that licked the sores on Lazarus' body.

When a social worker in some parts of Chicago has to promise that no controversial subjects will be discussed in a Park Forum, the cautiousness not to create any trouble is conspicuous. When a generous subscriber to a general financing body objects to its giving aid to a reputed social settlement on the alleged ground that it is run by " a fine bunch of Communists, Socialists and others of a subversive character," it is sufficient evidence to reveal the attitude that any " ism " different from that of his own is unworthy of support.

When a responsible person sees social settlements as important because they " yield a larger return for community protection and welfare per dollar invested than any other form of social service," contributions to social service from certain sources may be taken as merely " hush money " rather than genuine " offerings " for social welfare. The " Referents " in regard to social service, especially in the case of social settlements, are thus different in different areas of control. The possible sources of control are many.

Social settlements as a part of social work must take account of these forces in the future. It may be seen that a limiting control from a religious group is only one and probably not the most serious kind of control which must be taken into consideration. After all, dictatorship of a theological dogma may be preferable to the dictatorship of an economic or political dogma, even though both are to be avoided and guarded against.

The control and direction of organized social work are exercised through different media. These channels of control are :

1. The executory leaders who attempt to translate the ideal into social action.

2. The intrinsic potency of the idea or ideal implied in different forms of services.
3. The directing and controlling boards of individual agencies.
4. The clientele public.
5. General public opinion.
6. Community-wide organizations for planning and joint financing.

Charity, philanthropy, Christian benevolence, welfare work, social uplift, humanitarianism, social service—do these terms stand for different activities, or do they all mean the same thing? These varied labels are attached to a miscellaneous array of activities by different groups at different places, yet through them all one senses a sort of unity just as one senses it in the different religions of mankind of all places and times. The success or failure of such activities is dependent on the degree and force with which the community appreciates the social value of the same and is controlled by the idea. The story of the development of social work is the story of the education of the community in its social consciousness. The meaning of "social work," then, is what it envisages to do and how deep a root it takes in the mind of a community as obligatory and not optional.

In regard to the idea behind the settlement movement, the rigidity of contemporary society has controlled the growth of the movement towards what it started out to achieve. The settlement idea has at heart a thorough reconstruction of society and the attainment of the *social* ideal. After a visit among the settlements of the United States in the summer of 1908, Ramsay MacDonald of England wrote: "The supreme test of a settlement is whether it influences its neighborhood, whether it makes the good more easy and the bad more difficult. If it stops short of that it hardly justifies itself." [1]

The settlement idea as a technique of neighborhood and community work has persisted and grown. It has given rise to numerous neighborhood-improvement associations, social centers in the schools, community churches, and community clubs. The idea has gripped the communities, but the ideal is still in the struggling process of realization with setbacks and little success.

A major part of the success of any movement depends on the executive staff of institutions which serve as instruments to advance the movement. The executive head in a social service agency has to play different roles in relation to the ideal, to the directing board, to the profession as such, and to the contributing and clientele publics.

A social worker, especially the head resident of a social

[1] Quoted in Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

settlement, is not occupying an office which is well defined, to come in the category of a regular "job" with definite technical standards of training and efficiency. There is inherent an implied demand for a devotion and sense of office as if he or she were "called" for the task. Head residents of social settlements are always in need of a subjective assurance of a "call" and a sense of compulsion, for filling that office. As men and women of enthusiasm and imagination, the institution becomes to them something in which dreams may be realized. The "personality" of the social worker imprints itself on the "social work." Illustrations of the force of this element are numerous.

Years after the founding of the University of Chicago Settlement, a friend who was visiting the settlement, when remarking about the neighborhood, said: "These odors down here are the worst things I have ever experienced. But you, Miss McDowell, have become used to them, I suppose?" The answer came:

> "No, indeed! I might have trained myself to get used to them long ago. But if we want to get rid of the unpleasant things in our lives or in our culture, we must train ourselves *not* to ignore them. We must remain conscious of the bad things in order to fight to get rid of them." [1]

Miss McDowell did not go *down* to the neighborhood "bank of the yards" to do something *for* those poor people. She wanted to *belong* to the community and work *with* her neighbors for the improvement of *her* community. Thus the "Settlement Lady" became the "Good woman for bad husbands," to whom the helpless wives of such "bad husbands" turned for aid. She earned for herself the noble surnames "Fighting Mary," "Garbage Lady," "Social politician," and the good "relative." A neighborhood man wrote: "The Settlement is a kind friend to many people, and its Head Resident is like a relative whom many of the people in the community never see, but whose influence is felt by everyone." [2]

The role she played was well described in a local magazine:

> Miss Mary McDowell, of Chicago, is a settlement worker after the order of Toynbee and Jane Addams. Her life is becoming incorporated in the life of the community in which she lives; she is developing a neighborhood consciousness; she does not *stay*, but she *lives*, in the stockyards region and is learning to say "we" unconsciously.[3]

The amount of personal integrity, courage, and sincerity that these settlement pioneers needed to have to move between conflicting classes is illustrated in many situations which they had to encounter.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 28. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[3] Editorial, *Unity*, August 11, 1904.

One evening when Jane Addams was talking to a club of workmen, one of them called out :

"You won't talk like this when the millionaires begin to subsidize you."

"I don't intend," she replied, "either to be subsidized by millionaires, or bullied by labor-unionists ; I expect to keep on saying what I think without consulting either of them." The audience broke into applause.[1]

Apart from their relation to the clientele public, the executive officers serve as liaison officers between the technical staff, governing boards, and contributing constituency. In recent days, the executive head and technical staff are generally recruited from the group of professional social workers. The dominant leadership and influence of professional social workers in the determination of policy are undoubtedly great and probably decisive in many cases. Such control has vital significance to the future of social work, especially of the social work of the churches.

With the professionalization of social work has come the development of standards of administration based on widening experience and growing knowledge. As the skills involved in social work become increasingly technical, will there be a corresponding increase in the determination of policy by such technical experts? Does professional efficiency warrant any exclusive authority to that group? Has the community to rely upon their judgment as to how, and who, shall do social work? Has there or will there be any professional solidarity developing and operating in the field of social work, as in the case of medicine, to defeat the profession's own objectives?

Moreover, while social work has become secularized, professionalized, and attempts to be scientific, it is forgetting that it had its origin and inception as an art—the art of curing and healing the individual and social wounds through the medium of moral sympathy and an ethical sense of justice. Religion as "morality touched by emotion" has been the progenitor of social work. It is not that secularized social work could not be efficient and effective unless it is associated with organized religion. But organized social work as the child of organized religion, and the latter still having the functional role of creating and releasing moral energies in society, has always to rely on religion to fulfil its ultimate purpose. Neither social work nor religion can afford to lose the intimate interdependence. Interpretation of one to the other by the representatives of each are essential. The argument that private social work has to continue in order to make public social welfare work directive is fallacious if the

[1] Cf. James Weber Linn, *Jane Addams* (New York : D. Appleton-Century, 1935), p. 162.

former does not turn to religion for direction and meaning. "Modern man [is] in search of a soul," and no amount of technically efficient social work can answer that need except through religion.

Professional social work and professional schools for the training of social workers are wielding much influence in the shaping of personnel standards, as well as those of activities and general policy. The danger might come when the profession becomes self-conscious and in defence of the same forgets the purpose and meaning of social work.

William Graham Sumner long ago described "social work" as a case of "*A* and *B* getting together to tell *C* what he should do for *D*." At the present day, *A* stands for the moral and religious forces in a community and *B* stands for the professional social worker. *C* may be the controlling board of an agency, the contributing public, the community as a whole, or the State. Whatever *A*, *B*, and *C* may be, *D* is no longer any particular group of individuals or classes who are the so-called "unfortunates" or derelicts. *D* stands for the entire social organism and the basis of all social work is to promote, enhance, and sustain those values which are essential for the progress of the entire community. The interconnections and interdependence of *A*, *B*, *C*, and *D* are so clear and inviolate that if one does not recognize the other, each will struggle for its own preservation rather than for the welfare of the whole.

It is chiefly to the board of trustees or directors of an institution or agency that credit goes for the uninterrupted service rendered to the community by the respective agencies. The powers and functions of boards vary somewhat, according to whether the agency is a limited corporation or a membership agency or an auxiliary of another organization. Except in the latter case, the board either assumes direct responsibility for finance, management, and control, or else delegates that function to a smaller group of its own number which acts as an executive committee.

Membership on a board of a social agency may be sought as a prize or accepted as a duty; it may be given as a tribute to energetic devotion to, and vital interest in a cause; it may be merely an indication of prestige and financial standing in the community; or again, it may be in some cases the reflection of the interest of men and women of leisure.

> Places of influence in our noncommercial organizations are, however, open mainly to those who have acquired prestige in some other field. The governors of universities are selected partly on the basis of their business successes..... It is of importance that these offices are byproducts of achievements of another kind. They are prerogatives and responsibilities acquired incidentally; it might even be said that they are exercised ex officio or *ex statu*.

The interlocking the directorates of educational, charitable and other philanthropic agencies is due perhaps not so much to a cabal as to the very fact that they are philanthropic. Philanthropy, as we know it, implied economic success ; it comes late in a career. It may come only in the second generation of success. But when it does come, it is quite as much a matter of assuming certain prerogatives and responsibilities in the control of philanthropic institutions as of giving money. These prerogatives and responsibilities form part of the successful man's conception of himself and part of the world's expectation of him.[1]

A recent analysis of the governing boards of settlement houses in New York City shows that they are made up of people with prestige in business and professional life, as well as of some leisure and the ability to contribute something to the budget.[2]

An analysis of the board membership of social agencies in Chicago has been made with special reference to the extent of their activity, the occupational and social characteristics, and the residence of board members.[3]

A total of 41,786 persons were serving on the boards of 290 agencies in 1937. It was possible to identify occupationally almost half of the members of the boards or—in the case of nonemployed —of their husbands or fathers. Slightly over half of those whose occupations are known are members of professions. Lawyers constitute the largest single group. A major portion of the others are engaged in commerce and industry, mostly as managers and proprietors, bankers, and financiers. There are only very few teachers and clergymen.

These occupational data are supported by a residential distribution which shows a marked concentration in wealthier residential areas. There are fourteen of Chicago's seventy-five local community areas none of whose residents is represented on any of the boards of the social agencies studied. Of interest in the same connection is the fact that about 30 per cent of the board members of Chicago social agencies live outside of the city, mostly in the wealthy North Shore suburbs. In Lake Forest, where there is the heaviest suburban concentration, more than 3 per cent of the entire adult population serves on Chicago social agency boards. More than one-fourth of the board of the Chicago Community Fund lives in Lake Forest, and over half live

[1] Everett C. Hughes, "Institutional Office and the Person," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLIII, No. 3 (Nov., 1937), 404—13.

[2] Kennedy, Farra, and Associates, *Social Settlements in New York City* (New York : Columbia University Press, 1935), p. 487.

[3] Data presented here are taken from an unpublished paper read at the American Sociological Conference, 1938, in the section "Relation of Sociology to Social Work ;" Arthur Hillman, "The Community Control of Organized Social Work in Chicago," December 28, 1938.

in the North Shore suburbs.[1] Men and women are represented in almost equal numbers in the total group of board members.[2]

The number of boards of which individuals are members is of some interest. Eighty-seven per cent of the whole group are members of one board only, with an additional 9·5 per cent holding membership in two boards. Fifty-eight individuals, or slightly more than 1 per cent of the total, are members of four or more boards. Of them, 17 are leading business men; 15 are social workers, ministers, and others who serve on boards in an ex-officio capacity; while 8 are non-professional women, 3 are professors of sociology or social work, and 3 are judges.

While the interlocking between boards is not great, there is considerable overlapping of membership in social agencies boards with that of other community organizations. The Chicago Association of Commerce, including both business and professional people with open membership, has about 5,000 members and had 1,002 committee members in 1937, of whom about 14 per cent are also members of social agency boards. The Commercial Club of Chicago is a closed group of less than 200 business leaders, more than 60 per cent of whom are included on one or more social agency boards. The Social Register of Chicago and vicinity includes more than 3,300 names, exclusive of juniors. Of these socialites, 809, or 18 per cent, are board members.

The general conclusion to be drawn is that the pattern of urban business control is actually the pattern of control of social agencies. It is, on the whole, similar to the interlocking of business corporations. The absence of a corresponding interlocking between boards of social agencies does not indicate that the members are concentrating their interest and activities on particular agencies and do not spread out their interest on numerous social agencies. Despite the fact that there are many individuals who take a keen interest in the social agencies of which they are board members, many of them are on the boards because of their general prestige and financial strength. Many are unable to devote more than passing interest to the social agencies which they presumably help to promote and direct.

The wealthy humanitarian is a good man in a capitalistic society. By accepting a membership on a social agency board or by contributing money for philanthropic enterprises, he wins the

[1] The board members of three suburban agencies and those on the boards of four state-wide organizations who live outside of Chicago were excluded in making the residential distribution. This reduced the total by 222; the home addresses of an additional 435 were unknown, which left 4,129 individuals included in the residential distribution.

[2] In a study of 887 board members of 60 Los Angeles Welfare agencies, men were found to predominate, constituting 65·3 per cent of the total. Cf. T. J. Hicks, "An Analysis of the Directorates of Sixty Los Angeles Welfare Agencies (Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Social Work, Univ. of Southern California, 1936).

acclaim of society, which does not question the "taintedness" of his money or prestige. This attitude helps the financial stability of the social agency and also gives subjective satisfaction to the donor by reassuring him that he is after all not so bad as the glittering gold which he has accumulated tends to make him feel.

Instances are not wanting to show how boards of social agencies have expressed their prejudices in the shaping of policies. The lack of evangelical zeal on the part of Charles Zueblin made the Methodist Board withdraw support from his settlement activities in the early days. It was after that that he appealed to his Alma Mater, Northwestern University, and thus by the latter's co-operation established the Northwestern University Settlement.

The story of Jane Addams and her honorary degree from the University of Chicago may be mentioned in this connection to show how her settlement activities were looked upon as unworthy of recognition by the trustees of the University.

> She declined on occasion to accept contributions to Hull House funds from men who were notoriously unfair to their employees, but on the other hand she became a member of the "University Extension" staff of the new University of Chicago, an institution which the radicals declared was supported by "tainted money." Time, by the way, was to have its joke with both her and the University. In the early days of "Doctor Harper's Bazaar," as the University was often called, she was reproached by her "radical" friends for connecting herself, however remotely with such a backward institution. But fifteen years later, when the professors of the University voted to confer on her an honorary degree, the conservative successor to Doctor Harper, and his cautious board of trustees, declined to confirm the action. Professors Albion W. Small and George Herbert Mead, who in the fullness of their enthusiasm had neglected formalities and notified Jane Addams of the professorial vote, were forced to go to Hull House and with tears in their eyes explain the situation and apologize for the administration. It was to be more than twenty years from that time before the administration did confirm the early action of the faculty, and offer her a degree. She took it with one regret—that Professor Small could not know of it.[1]

While President Harper officially and personally regarded the University of Chicago Settlement as a vital part of the University work and said that any hindrance to the Settlement work would be affecting throughout the University, his successor and trustees were unwilling to credit the "mother of settlements" in Chicago as worthy of official recognition.

[1] Linn, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

The characterization of boards of American Universities as "academic holding companies" [1] is based on the composition of the personnel and their attitudes and policies.

Whether educational institutions or social service agencies, financial dependence on the voluntary gifts of wealthy individuals which keep these institutions "going" make them "limping" as well. Social work, mainly of the type that is necessitated by the unequitable distribution of wealth, has its sources of support from those areas which are advantageously placed in this system. Hence the anomalous practice of amelioration rather than social reconstruction is continued.

Many social agencies in Chicago find it necessary to depend on the continued good will of large givers. Some agencies have made successful efforts to broaden their base of support.

> Of 36 individuals who contributed over $500 to the United Charities in 1936, 35 made contributions in 1930, 14 in 1920 and 7 in 1910. The average amounts contributed by these donors fluctuated from year to year, ranging from less than $500 in 1910 to the highest point in 1930 of nearly $2,700. The record of the persons who contributed $500 or over to the Jewish charities in 1937 shows somewhat more regularity in amount from 1925 on. This group numbered 276 in 1937, of whom 94 per cent had contributed in 1930 and 85% in 1925. The Jewish charities had the longest experience in Chicago in federated financing and its effect has been to establish habits of giving backed by family and religious traditions. An original donation of $10 or less was made by 60 of the people who gave $500 or over in 1937. The bulk of these small initial donations was made before 1920 and the last in 1924. This sharp rise in individual contributions testifies either to increased generosity or improved economic status or both.[2]

Many of these agencies, having no steady income from endowments or invested funds and mainly dependent on the voluntary contributions for their annual expenditures, have to keep up the professional standard of efficiency on one side and enlist the cooperative good will of the supporters. The fear of alienating the support of large givers is therefore a great factor in the conduct of social work in Chicago. This is all the more significant, as the wealthy in Chicago do not yet have deeply ingrained habits

[1] Kirkpatrick, *op. cit.*, chaps. viii, ix. Scott Nearing's report on the personnel of college and university boards, published in *School and Society* (1917), pp. 93—99: "The report covers the boards of 243 institutions. The total membership of the boards of these colleges and universities is 2,470. Of this number 930 were in business, more than 2/3 of them in merchandise, banking and manufacturing. 1,269 of the total number were from the professional classes, 514 of this class were lawyers; 353 were ministers.....Of the entire number only 125 were classed as educators, while 123 were farmers and 3 mechanics."

[2] Hillman, *op. cit.*

of philanthropy. The per-capita giving to organized social work in Chicago is exceeded by New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Cincinnati—and, in fact, by most of the major centers of population.[1]

There have been instances in the case of social settlements where contributors have withheld their gifts on account of disagreement in policy and activities. In 1901, due to Jane Addams' activities on behalf of Abraham Isaak, a Russian Jew, who was arrested as an anarchist suspect, much resentment was expressed. One of the important contributors, Mrs. Palmer, withdrew her support from Hull House.[2] The transference of some neighborhood houses from the Protestant sectarian to non-sectarian management is due to the disagreement between the head residents and the denominational boards of respective agencies.

The success of any social enterprise is very largely dependent on the co-operation of the participants. The clientele public in social work is not merely recipient of services rendered, but actually participates in the work. This is all the more true in regard to settlement work. No good neighborliness could make any headway unless the neighbors appreciate and understand the meaning of that neighborliness. Leadership in community improvement can only help the community to lead itself up from squalor and disorganization. The control of the clientele over the social agencies is such that no agency could afford to alienate their good will and co-operation. Many of the settlement pioneers had to overcome the suspicions of their neighbors by frankness and sincerity. Protestant neighborhood houses which are located in areas where a large percentage of the residents are non-Protestants bear the brunt of the oft-repeated criticism that they are established for proselytizing purposes.

The danger in social work is that very often it takes on the air of condescending paternalism. There is nothing more demoralizing than doing good *for* someone below, as if it were a favor extended out of graciousness, and to expect gratitude in return. Democracy means a *levelling up* of all the values in life and all families and all communities should have all that the best families or communities have. The clientele participation is important not so much because they are on the receiving end, but they should be made conscious of their dignity—the dignity of the common man—and be made to demand what all have a right to have.

Formation of public opinion in favour of or against any policy plays a major part in the success or failure of any movement. The evolution of charity throughout history has been the story of the change in public opinion in regard to the values of

[1] Cf. Wayne McMillan, "Joint Financing of Private Social Work in Chicago," *Social Service Review*, XI (March, 1937), 47.

[2] Linn, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

such work and the acceptance of the same as a duty. Schools, hospitals, orphanages, old people's homes—all having their origins due to private initiative—have today become public charges to a great extent. Eleemosynary activities have been encouraged and acclaimed in general. But wherever there has been any rumbling regarding social injustice or agitation for any reconstruction, opposition has been violent. The open abuse of and violent opposition to the activities of Jane Addams and Graham Taylor during the early part of this century are classic examples of hysterical panic and mob psychology. It was all the more poignant when people in high places joined the chorus and condemned these two apostles of peace and justice as inciters of anarchistic violence and brutality.

During the panic of 1901, when Abraham Isaak was arrested and Jane Addams stood by him, there was a whirlwind of disapprobation. It was at this time that the Reverend John Thompson of Grace Methodist Church declared in an interview: "So far as I have observed, I have never discovered that the social settlements did much good, whether under Christian auspices or not"; and the Reverend James S. Stone, rector of St. James, went still further: "I do not think there is any benefit to be derived from any alliance of a church with sociological movements."[1]

Five years later, after the "Auerbuch tragedy," Chicago Commons, Hull House, and all the other settlements and their staffs were targets of attack and abuse. To the superintendent of police, the social settlements were first cousins to the anarchists. The editorial hysteria of the reactionary press was more vehement.[2] While the *Chicago Chronicle* and the *Inter-Ocean* attacked, the *Chicago Daily News* and the *Chicago Evening Post* defended the settlements.

The Saturday editorials of Graham Taylor in the *Chicago Daily News* for more than thirty years have been instrumental in the formation of public opinion as well as in the interpretation of social democracy. The press in Chicago has generally been fair in its advocacy of private social work.[3] Since the organization of the Council of Social Agencies and more recently of the Community Fund, more accurate and intelligent interpretation of social work has been given to the public through the press. But discussions of national relief policies with local implications are usually partisan and captious. The continuous attack on the relief policy and administration, making use of customary slogans such as "economy in government," the importance of "business-like" management, and elimination of fraud, reveal the opposition

[1] Linn, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

[2] Taylor, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*, pp. 205-9, 322-27.

[3] Social Work Publicity Council, *I See by the Papers* (Chicago, 1936).

of the reactionary press to the principle of public relief responsibility for any but the altogether destitute. The use of the press in this instance is only one aspect of the dominance of business interest in community control. A particularly vicious and misinforming series of articles, recently published by the *Chicago Tribune* on the local W. P. A. administration, is an extreme instance in point.[1]

There are other kinds of pressures from particular groups in the formation of opinion with reference to public relief and welfare generally. Some of these represent established organizations, while others represent special interests. These pressure groups may demand more assistance for all clients, or special favors for certain elements of the community such as Catholics, veterans, or the aged.[2]

In general, two large issues emerge from the consideration of factors involved in the control of voluntary social work and public welfare programs. One is the balance in control between those who seek to minister to the needs of the community with high standards of service and fair sense of justice, on the one hand; and the big givers and taxpayers whose philosophy and conception of what is adequate, fair, and desirable for the community may diverge at critical points, on the other hand. The "American dream" varies with the nature of the pillow on which different dreaming heads rest. The other is the question of including all community interests in the planning of social work. Community-wide organizations for planning and joint financing play a vital part in the control of social service.

The general planning and funding organizations in Chicago are the Council of Social Agencies and the Community Fund. The Council of Social Agencies was organized in 1914 as a delegate body. Its activities were carried on by full-time officers after 1919, and it has since greatly enlarged its functions and independent services. It includes from one-half to three-fourths of all the agencies engaged in family service, camps and outings, day nurseries, employment and vocational guidance, and protective and probationary work. Less than half of the agencies which maintain homes for the aged, or for dependent children, or which do child-placing work, participate in the Council. This latter group is mainly sectarian, and does not easily yield to the planning and standard-raising activities of the Council.

[1] Cf. Press Release of Howard O. Hunter, Assistant Federal Administrator, W. P. A., mimeographed, September 21, 1938, which refuted these charges in detail where alleged factual statements had been made. Illinois Council on Public Assistance and Employment, *Preliminary Report* on Administratiou of Relief in Chicago, January 25, 1938. *Report and Further Recommendations on the Administration of Relief in Chicago*, July 12, 1938. *Chicago Daily News*, July 13, 1938. Cf. comments of Amelia Sears on these reports in the News Letter of the Council of Social agencies, October 24, 1938.

[2] Cf. Helen Seymour, *When Clients Organize* (Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1937).

The union of forces of voluntary social work in the Council of Social Agencies has been credited with leadership in the establishment of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare in 1925 and has helped to maintain the principle then established of administration by professionally competent people.[1] The Council also helped in planning the unemployment relief program in the early 1930's,[2] as well as in the establishment of the Community Fund.

The Community Fund, which derives a third of its income from contributions from the employee groups in corporations and the rest from individuals, corporations, and other minor sources, is confronted with the problem of easing tensions from different angles.

Many questions arise at this point. Has the Fund any right to direct the activities and policies of any agency to which it gives aid? If so, in whose interest does it undertake to do that? With income from such diversified groups, will it be democratic to yield to the pressure of one individual or group to regiment agencies to carry on activities which will not affect their particular interests adversely?

The argument that settlements are located in the most depressed areas and have a restraining influence in the neighborhood, and hence are worthy of support, may backfire if it is recognized by the neighborhood itself. In the medieval ages, individuals bought their way into heaven by giving alms. During John Wesley's days, the aristocratic group in England, it is told, resented the social service program very much in the beginning, but they were gratified and co-operated when they recognized that Wesley's program had saved England from an economic revolution by the uprising of the disinherited masses. Today, private social service is supported by certain individuals and groups as one of the means of preserving rather than reconstructing an already decaying order of society. While the reviewing committees of the Council of Social Agencies serve as a standard improving medium, the Community Fund tends to be a policy-shaping agency. If the main objective of the Fund is "the gradual evolution of a community plan," any interference with the basic policy of any participating agency is likely to curb freedom of expansion, reconstruction, and growth within the community. Community planning can be effected, so far as the Fund is concerned, by co-ordinating existing social service agencies rather

[1] J. L. Moss, "A County Public Welfare Program in a Large City," *Social Service Review*, V, 368—69; "*Annual Report* of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare for the year 1927," in *Charity Service Reports*, Cook County, Illinois, p. 157.

[2] Clorinne McC. Brandenburg, "Chicago Relief and Service Statistics, 1928—1931" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, 1932, pp. 8 f.).

than by interfering in the policy of any agency to say how it should serve a community.

The fact that the Fund authorities insisted on the separation of the Social Action Department of the Chicago Church Federation from the Social Service Department before it could give any aid to the latter seems to indicate that the Fund envisages serving as an " ambulance corps " in the community. In spite of the democratic nature of its support, the Fund seems to shape its policy in a way that would appear to be partisan. Dependence on wealthy individuals and corporations for nearly two-thirds of its resources makes the Fund cautious in its disbursement. If the employee groups recognize this and decide to withdraw and set up a Fund of their own which would have a policy that would serve their interests of social reconstruction by radical changes in the present system of society, and take under its wings such of those agencies as would develop programs and activities towards that end, would it not be more conducive to help establish social justice rather than maintain the *status quo?*

In regard to the participating agencies themselves, the strict budget control exercised over them by the Fund, assuming no responsibility for additional funds needed for improvement and extensions of service, by itself creates problems. If dependence on the Fund to meet part of the "deficit" budget involves restriction in the freedom of shaping policy too, private social service agencies might become service stations for the sick and the wounded in the social war, rather than creative centers of diagnosis and experimentation. The objectives and ideals underlying the settlement movement at best are not the preservation of what is, but the creation of what ought to be. Family service, care of children, hospitalization, protective work, and the like are not likely to be challenged as " undermining the capitalistic system " or any other political or social institutions in existence today. Group-work agencies, especially the settlements and neighborhood houses, are the possible avenues of ethical expression and development of community consciousness in a metropolitan center. All the other forms of social service carried on by private agencies can be entirely taken over by public agencies without much difficulty. In fact, most of such types of work are now under public auspices. But such " pioneering on social frontiers " as is generally done in settlements is less apt to be successfully launched under public auspices. Their constructive and creative roles will be effective only so long as they are private and at the same time free from the " tyranny of the financial supporter."

C. M. S. Press, Kottayam—1939.